APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,331	01/04/2000	GORDON ARNOLD	52817.000087	9092

29315   7590   05/05/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
HU, JINSONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/477,331	Applicant(s) ARNOLD ET AL.
	Examiner Jinsong Hu	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 March 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are pending in the application.

      4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
           application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

      * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-28 are presented for examination. Claims 1-3, 9, 18, 25-27 have been

amended. Claim 28 is a newly added claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard

et al. (US 6,233,318).

4.   As per claim 1, Picard teaches the invention as claimed including a method of

managing a plurality of messages stored in a plurality of individual message accounts

[col. 1, lines 44-67] comprising the steps of:

accepting a user access request at a access port [80, Fig. 2] to access selected

ones of the plurality of individual message accounts, wherein the plurality of individual

message accounts are determined based on information associated with the user [col. 4, lines 19-23 & 40-46; col. 6, lines 29-34];

accessing at least one of a password and a user ID corresponding to the plurality of individual messaging accounts [col. 10, lines 46-48; col. 15, lines 65-67; col. 17, lines 30-36];

matching the at least one of the password and user ID with the corresponding selected individual messaging accounts [col. 10, lines 48-52; col. 17, lines 36-39];

obtaining access to each of the selected individual messaging accounts by providing each of the selected individual messaging accounts with the corresponding at least one of the password and user ID [col. 15, line 67 – col. 16, line 4; col. 17, lines 39-48]; and

transmitting a set of access requests to a corresponding set of the individual message accounts [col. 5, lines 24-44; col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 10; col. 17, lines 48-61].

5.   As per claims 2-3 and 7-8, Picard teaches the step of transmitting a consolidated message list, including at least the messages pending in each of the selected individual message accounts [col. 7, lines 13-19]; associating the message process request with the corresponding massages in the consolidated message list [col. 7, lines 20-21]; and transmitting the message process request to the corresponding set of individual message accounts [col. 5, lines 36-39; col. 7, lines 21-23].

6.   As per claim 4, Picard teaches the message access port comprises a proxy

server [col. 10, lines 7-12 & 46-54; col. 19, lines 50-54].

7.   As per claim 5, Picard teaches the individual accounts have assignable network

address [col. 1, lines 44-51].

8.   As per claim 6, Picard teaches the POP standard is utilized in at least one step

[col. 12, lines 11-14 & 29-33].

9.   As per claims 9-17, since they are system claims of claims 1-4 and 6-8, they are

rejected under the same basis as claims 1-4 and 6-8.

10.   As per claims 18-24, since they are structure claims of claims 1-4 and 6-8, they

are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-4 and 6-8.

11.   As per claims 25-27, since they are computer program claims of claims 1-3, they

are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-3.

12.   As per claim 28, Picard teaches the invention as claimed including a system for

enabling a user to manage a plurality of messages stored in two or more individual

accounts associated with different service provider [col. 1, lines 44-67], the system

comprising:

two or more individual messaging accounts associated with different service

providers [col. 4, lines 19-23; col. 6, lines 29-34];

an interface module [132, Fig. 5] for determining a user and matching the user to

the corresponding two or more individual messaging accounts [col. 15, lines 61-67; col.

17, lines 30-39];

an authorization module [176, Fig, 7] for accessing each of the two or more

individual messaging accounts associated with the user, wherein the authorization

module references the storage module and matches the at least one of the user ID and

password with the corresponding two or more individual messaging accounts

associated with the user, and wherein the authorization module provides each of the

two or more individual messaging accounts with the corresponding at least one of the

user ID and password [177, 178, Fig. 7; col. 15, line 67 – col. 16, line 4; col. 17, lines

39-61].

Conclusion

13.   Applicant's arguments filed on 3/1/04 for claims 1-28 have been fully considered

but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

14.   In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that (1) Picard does not discloses

individually access the various multimedia messages; (2) Picard does not discloses

obtaining access to each of the various multimedia messages stored in various

individual messaging accounts; (3) Picard does not discloses obtaining access to each

of the selected individual messaging accounts by providing each of the selected

individual messaging accounts with the corresponding at least one of the user ID and

password; (4) Picard does not discloses a system that protects each messaging

account with a password and user ID; (4) Picard does not disclose two or more

individual messaging accounts associated with different service provider.

15.   Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A.   As to point (1), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Picard's

reference for retrieving the messages from a client's several existing messaging

accounts [i.e., individual accounts] which supported by different service providers;

Furthermore, there is no any limitation in the claim direct to "individually access various

messaging accounts" at different time as the applicant argued. In contrast, in claim 1, it

reads as " to access selected ones of the plurality of individual messaging accounts"

and "matching the at least ...... password ...... with the corresponding selected

individual messaging accounts", i.e., the steps claimed by the applicant are used for

accessing several individual accounts at same time, they are not implemented for

"individually access various messaging accounts" at different time. Therefore, Picard

does teach the limitation in claim 1.

B.   As to points (2)-(4), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Picard's

reference for performing user accessing authorization and validation based on login

information provided by the user when he/her try to access messaging accounts, and

transferring the messages from different individual messaging accounts to the user only

when the accessing authorization and validation are successful. Furthermore, there is

no limitation in the claim direct to individually enter user ID and password for each of the

various multimedia messages stored in various individual messaging accounts. In

contrast, applicant claimed to "[access] at least one of a password ...... corresponding

to the plurality of individual messaging accounts", which means the authorization for

accessing various messaging accounts will be made only based on "at least a password

and a user ID" entered by the user at the beginning of the accessing. Therefore, Picard

do discloses obtaining access to each of the selected individual messaging accounts by

providing each of the selected individual messaging accounts with the corresponding at

least one of the user ID and password.

C. As to point (5), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Picard for managing

various type messages stored in several individual accounts on different systems [col.

4, lines 19-23].

Accordingly, Picard is a relevant prior art reference.

16.   Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

17.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

19.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax number for this Group 2100 is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Jinsong Hu

April 30, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100